

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action of October 31, 2007. Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yoakum* (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,797).

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A communications system, comprising:
a first communication suite comprising:
a plurality of communications accounts of a first user for a first communications service; and
at least one communications account of the first user for a second communications service;

first logic configured to recognize that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and

second logic configured to direct the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Yoakum* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “first logic configured to recognize that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and second logic configured to direct the second communications service to assume an active state of

service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Yoakum* describes a process for detecting a degree of user participation in a communication session and for using this participation information to generate presence information which may indicate whether the user can be interrupted to accept other communications. See col. 2, lines 30-56. Accordingly, *Yoakum* describes that devices that support communications with the user may be evaluated in order to determine the presence information for the user. See cols. 3-4, lines 64-23. Further, *Yoakum* describes that a user may designate rules to control how presence information is determined. In a first example, a user’s presence information is determined to be “available” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is on-hook. In a second example, the user’s presence information is determined to be “unavailable” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is off-hook. See col. 12, lines 2-22.

As such, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest “first logic configured to recognize that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized, as recited in claim 1.” Rather, *Yoakum* discloses a process that detects if a piece of communications equipment (e.g., a communications device) is in use. Further, *Yoakum* fails to teach or suggest at least “second logic configured to direct the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, *Yoakum* discloses a process that determines a user’s presence information according to the

user's use of communications equipment and does not disclose that one communications account is made to assume an active or inactive state of service based on the state of service of another communications account.

For at least these reasons, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-6

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-6 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 7

As provided in independent claim 7, Applicants claim:

A system for integrating communications services, comprising:

a first communication suite profile having a first plurality of communications services, wherein a particular user has a respective communications account for each of the first plurality of communications services; and

first logic configured to:

determine if the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user;

upon a determination that the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an active state of service; and

upon a determination that the particular user is not actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing said each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an inactive state of service, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services operate at an active level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at an inactive level of service that provides reduced functionality than the active level of service.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 is allowable for at least the reason that *Yoakum* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “first logic configured to: determine if the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user; upon a determination that the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an active state of service; and upon a determination that the particular user is not actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing said each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an inactive state of service, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services operate at an active level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at an inactive level of service that provides reduced functionality than the active level of service,” as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Yoakum* describes a process for detecting a degree of user participation in a communication session and for using this participation information to generate presence information which may indicate whether the user can be interrupted to accept other communications. See col. 2, lines 30-56. Accordingly, *Yoakum* describes that devices that support communications with the user may be evaluated in order to determine the presence information for the user. See cols. 3-4, lines 64-23. Further, *Yoakum* describes that a user may designate rules to control how presence information is determined. In a first example, a user’s presence information is determined to be “available” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is on-hook. In a second example, the user’s presence information is determined to be “unavailable” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is off-hook. See col. 12, lines 2-22.

As such, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest “first logic configured to: determine if the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user,” as recited in claim 7. Rather, *Yoakum* discloses a process that detects if a piece of

communications equipment (e.g., a communications device) is in use. Further, *Yoakum* fails to teach or suggest at least “upon a determination that the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an active state of service; and upon a determination that the particular user is not actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing said each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an inactive state of service, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services operate at an active level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at an inactive level of service that provides reduced functionality than the active level of service,” as recited in claim 7. Rather, *Yoakum* discloses a process that determines a user’s presence information according to the user’s use of communications equipment and does not disclose that one communications account is made to assume an active or inactive state of service based on the state of service of another communications account.

Accordingly, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7, and the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 8-13

For at least the reasons given above, claim 7 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 8-13 depend from claim 7 and recite additional features, claims 8-13 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 14

As provided in independent claim 14, Applicants claim:

A communications system, comprising:
means for providing a first communication suite having a plurality of communications accounts of a first user for a first communications service and at least one communications account of the first user for the second communications service;

means for recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and

means for directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Yoakum* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “means for recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and means for directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Yoakum* describes a process for detecting a degree of user participation in a communication session and for using this participation information to generate presence information which may indicate whether the user can be interrupted to accept other communications. See col. 2, lines 30-56. Accordingly, *Yoakum* describes that devices that support communications with the user may be evaluated in order to determine the presence information for the user. See cols. 3-4, lines 64-23. Further, *Yoakum* describes that a user may designate rules to control how presence information is determined. In a first example, a user’s presence information is determined to be “available” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is on-hook. In a second example, the user’s presence information is determined to be

“unavailable” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is off-hook. See col. 12, lines 2-22.

As such, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest “means for recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized,” as recited in claim 14. Rather, *Yoakum* discloses a process that detects if a piece of communications equipment (e.g., a communications device) is in use. Further, *Yoakum* fails to teach or suggest at least “means for directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited in claim 14. Rather, *Yoakum* discloses a process that determines a user’s presence information according to the user’s use of communications equipment and does not disclose that one communications account is made to assume an active or inactive state of service based on the state of service of another communications account.

For at least these reasons, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 14, and the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

e. Claims 15-16

For at least the reasons given above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 15-16 depend from claim 14 and recite additional features, claims 15-16 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

f. Claim 17

As provided in independent claim 17, Applicants claim:

A method for integration communications services, comprising:
providing a suite of communications services having at least one
first communications account of a user for a first communications service

and at least one second communications account of the user for a second communications service; and

directing each communications service of the user in the suite to initiate an active state of service via the communications accounts if the user is actively utilizing any communications account in the suite.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 17 is allowable for at least the reason that *Yoakum* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “directing each communications service of the user in the suite to initiate an active state of service via the communications accounts if the user is actively utilizing any communications account in the suite,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Yoakum* describes a process for detecting a degree of user participation in a communication session and for using this participation information to generate presence information which may indicate whether the user can be interrupted to accept other communications. See col. 2, lines 30-56. Accordingly, *Yoakum* describes that devices that support communications with the user may be evaluated in order to determine the presence information for the user. See cols. 3-4, lines 64-23. Further, *Yoakum* describes that a user may designate rules to control how presence information is determined. In a first example, a user’s presence information is determined to be “available” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is on-hook. In a second example, the user’s presence information is determined to be “unavailable” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is off-hook. See col. 12, lines 2-22.

Further, *Yoakum* discloses a process that determines a user’s presence information according to the user’s use of communications equipment and does not disclose that one communications account is made to assume an active or inactive state of service based on the state of service of another communications account. Accordingly, *Yoakum* fails to teach or suggest at least “directing each communications service of the user in the suite to initiate an active state of service via the communications accounts if the user is actively utilizing any communications account in the suite,” as recited in claim 17.

For at least these reasons, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 17, and the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

g. Claims 18-20

For at least the reasons given above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 18-20 depend from claim 17 and recite additional features, claims 18-20 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

h. Claim 21

As provided in independent claim 21, Applicants claim:

A method for integrating communications services, comprising:
providing a first association of a plurality of first communications accounts for a first communications service;

providing a second association of a plurality of second communications accounts for a second communications service;

detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association;

upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and

upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Yoakum* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association; upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of

service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Yoakum* describes a process for detecting a degree of user participation in a communication session and for using this participation information to generate presence information which may indicate whether the user can be interrupted to accept other communications. See col. 2, lines 30-56. Accordingly, *Yoakum* describes that devices that support communications with the user may be evaluated in order to determine the presence information for the user. See cols. 3-4, lines 64-23. Further, *Yoakum* describes that a user may designate rules to control how presence information is determined. In a first example, a user’s presence information is determined to be “available” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is on-hook. In a second example, the user’s presence information is determined to be “unavailable” if the user’s office PC is in use and the office telephone is off-hook. See col. 12, lines 2-22.

Further, *Yoakum* discloses a process that determines a user’s presence information according to the user’s use of communications equipment and does not disclose that one communications account is made to assume an active or inactive state of service based on the state of service of another communications account. Accordingly, *Yoakum* fails to teach or suggest at least “detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association; upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited in claim 21.

Accordingly, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 21, and the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

i. Claims 22-23

For at least the reasons given above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 22-23 depend from claim 21 and recite additional features, claims 22-23 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

j. Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicants claim:

A communications method, comprising:

providing a first communication suite having a plurality of communications accounts of a first user for a first communications service and at least one communications account of the first user for the second communications service;

recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and

directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the recognizing step, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service, the first communications service and the second communications service being able to assume either an active or inactive state.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Yoakum* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the recognizing step, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service, the first communications service and the second communications service being able to assume either an active or inactive state” as emphasized above.

For example, *Yoakum* describes a process for detecting a degree of user participation in a communication session and for using this participation information to generate presence information which may indicate whether the user can be interrupted to accept other communications. See col. 2, lines 30-56. Accordingly, *Yoakum* describes that devices that support communications with the user may be evaluated in order to determine the presence information for the user. See cols. 3-4, lines 64-23. Further, *Yoakum* describes that a user may designate rules to control how presence information is determined. In a first example, a user's presence information is determined to be "available" if the user's office PC is in use and the office telephone is on-hook. In a second example, the user's presence information is determined to be "unavailable" if the user's office PC is in use and the office telephone is off-hook. See col. 12, lines 2-22.

Further, *Yoakum* discloses a process that determines a user's presence information according to the user's use of communications equipment and does not disclose that one communications account is made to assume an active or inactive state of service based on the state of service of another communications account. Accordingly, *Yoakum* fails to teach or suggest at least "detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association; upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service," as recited in claim 24.

Accordingly, *Yoakum* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 24, and the rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn.

k. Claims 25-26

For at least the reasons given above, claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 25-26 depend from claim 24 and recite additional features, claims 25-26 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicants reserve the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicants. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500